

Applic. No. 10/676,589
Amdt. dated October 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 18, 2005

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-12 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-5 and 7-12 have been rejected as being obvious over Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,793,406 B1) (hereinafter "Edwards") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 8, lines 7-17 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

the transparent coupling area formed integral with the holding area and the connecting area, the transparent coupling area,

Applic. No. 10/676,589
Amdt. dated October 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 18, 2005

the holding area, and the connecting area being formed of the same material.

The Edwards reference discloses a receptacle assembly (11) which includes a lens assembly (36) formed of plastic and a spacer (35) formed of glass.

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The reference does not show the transparent coupling area formed integral with the holding area and the connecting area, the transparent coupling area, the holding area, and the connecting area being formed of the same material, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Edwards reference discloses a coupling area having a lens assembly formed of plastic and a spacer formed of glass. Edwards does not disclose a coupling area that is formed of the same material as a holding area and a connecting area. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the transparent coupling area, the holding area and the connecting area are formed of the same material.

Applic. No. 10/676,589
Amdt. dated October 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 18, 2005

Furthermore, the Examiner's comments on page 6 of the Office action the Examiner stated that "although the materials are different", concurs with the fact that Edwards does not show or suggest that a transparent coupling area is formed of the same material as a holding area and a connecting area.

The reference applied by the Examiner does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, it is believed that the reference applied by the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Edwards, dependent claims 2-5 and 7-12 are believed to be allowable over Edwards as well.

The following remarks pertain to claim 7.

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner incorrectly stated on page 7 of the Office action that "Applicant argues that the horizontal base plate disclosed by Edwards et al is not recited claim 7." Applicants stated that the horizontally running base plate, as recited in claim 7 of the instant application is not disclosed in Edwards. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's comments applicants did not argue

Appl. No. 10/676,589
Amdt. dated October 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 18, 2005

that claim 7 of the instant application discloses that the horizontal base plate must be a separate component.

In the last paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claim 6 has been rejected as being obvious over Edwards (U.S. Patent No. 6,793,406 B1) in view of Roberts (DE 33 16 236 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Roberts does not make up for the deficiencies of Edwards. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 6 is believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

10-18-'05 16:32 FROM-Lerner & Greenberg

+9549251101

T-654 P11/11 U-677

Applic. No. 10/676,589
Amdt. dated October 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 18, 2005

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner &
Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

October 18, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101